

August 23, 1965

I think it is inappropriate to come in at this late hour and try to change the site without any provision for money to buy the site. The bill merely provides for a site in the vicinity of the Pennsylvania Avenue development program. It seems to me this is quite realistic. If it had been provided for originally and we had been able to get a site, it would be another matter, but a great amount of time, money, and effort have been expended on the development of the site. Aside from that fact, I think it comes too late to try to change it now. It would destroy the present concept altogether.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Arkansas has commented on the pending Cultural Center site. As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, let me say that in view of the developments, I believe it is an excellent choice. It would be a great mistake to try to disrupt the program now by getting into controversy over location of the center. The program is coming along nicely.

As the Senator from Arkansas knows, it is expected that a substantial drive will be conducted to obtain private funds and contributions. Our citizens have been led to believe that the site has been agreed upon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Some \$15 million has been raised privately.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, the Senator is correct, but not only that, as we look at the situation in retrospect, and when we take into account the plans which are now in the blueprint stage for other developments in the District of Columbia, I believe that it is an excellent site.

This may be a sentimental argument on my part, but I believe it is a most appropriate site in view of the fact that President Kennedy's burial place is just across the river, with its everlasting torch aflame. Thus, this center will be among other shrines in the area, such as the Lincoln Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial, and other memorials. The Cultural Center is, after all, being built as a great memorial to our great President Kennedy, and is most appropriately located at the site which has been selected.

Accordingly, I sincerely hope that plans for completing the Center will proceed without any controversy being raised at this date over its location.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his comments. They are entirely appropriate.

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD CONCERNING A CHRONOLOGY PUBLISHED BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS ON THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Dodd) has today issued a press release entitled "Senator Dodd Charges Foreign Relations Publication on Dominican Crisis Blasted Against Administration."

The allegation is that the chronology quoted exclusively from press sources

critical of administration policy in the Dominican Republic. The remarks of the senior Senator from Connecticut included complaints that the chronology did not bear statements favorable to the position of the administration.

The facts are as follows:

First. The document to which the senior Senator refers was issued in early July for use of the committee in connection with its effort to learn in detail of developments in the Dominican Republic. It was compiled, as noted in the preface, from material "collected with the assistance of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the Department of State, and the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations." Because of shortage of time, the staff of the committee in compiling the chronology made extensive use of a research instrument to which it subscribes entitled "Deadline Data."

Second. The statement of the senior Senator from Connecticut leaves the impression that the administration views were not adequately presented in the chronology. Members should note, however, that the chronology and the accompanying printed material includes not only a number of documents issued by the Organization of American States, but six statements by President Johnson, and a number of statements by the Department of State and one by Ambassador Stevenson.

Third. I do wish to express my regret that it has not been possible for the senior Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Dodd) to attend meetings of the Foreign Relations Committee on this subject. Much of the material to which he referred has been considered by the committee.

Fourth. Finally, I wish the Record to show that all of the witnesses which the committee heard at the sessions not attended by the Senator from Connecticut were administration witnesses, save one. We heard the testimony of Secretary of State Rusk, Under Secretary of State Mann, Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance, Ambassador Bennett, Admiral Raborn, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Assistant Secretary of State for American Republics Affairs Vaughn. The only non-Government witness called before the committee was the former Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marin.

Investigations of acts of the executive department by their very nature, as the Senator well knows, put the burden on the administration to prove that its actions were correct. I believe that a fair criticism of the committee might be that it put too much time and effort into the examination of Government witnesses, and not enough into examination of Government critics.

The committee has met on 13 different occasions, compiling some 700 pages of testimony. Most of the meetings have been 2 or 3 hours in length. The senior Senator from Connecticut attended one of these meetings, and a search of the committee records indicates that he has not seen fit to consult the transcripts of those hearings.

FURTHER AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7700) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of Aug. 18, 1965, pp. 20132-20135, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, today, there came to my attention a document entitled "Why Vietnam," which includes some historical documents—letters written by President Kennedy and President Eisenhower, and statements made by President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. It is a most informative document and will be helpful to citizens who wish to study step by step the nature and extent of our involvement in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent to have this document printed in the Record for the information of all Senators.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHY VIETNAM FOREWORD

MY FELLOW AMERICANS: Once again, in man's age-old struggle for a better life and a world of peace, the wisdom, courage, and compassion of the American people are being put to the test. This is the meaning of the tragic conflict in Vietnam.

In meeting the present challenge, it is essential that our people seek understanding, and that our leaders speak with candor.

I have therefore directed that this report to the American people be compiled and widely distributed. In its pages you will find statements on Vietnam by three leaders of your Government—by your President, your Secretary of State, and your Secretary of Defense.

These statements were prepared for different audiences, and they reflect the differing responsibilities of each speaker. The congressional testimony has been edited to avoid undue repetition and to incorporate the sense of the discussions that followed.

Together, they construct a clear definition of America's role in the Vietnam conflict: the dangers and hopes that Vietnam holds for all free men, the failures and hopes of our national objectives in a war we do not seek, the constant effort on our part to bring this war to a just and honorable end.

August 20, 1965.

In the historic documents that follow, two American Presidents define and explain